



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine.

VOL. XIII

APRIL, 1912.

No. 2

THE BARONIES OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

By Henry A. M. Smith.

VIII.

BOONE'S BARONY.

This barony, popularly denominated such, was one in so far as it was laid out to a Cassique who was entitled under the Fundamental Constitutions to hold a barony, but was not one under the true definition of a barony in South Carolina as given in the first article of this series on the baronies of South Carolina, because it did not contain the requisite number of acres, viz: 12,000. It is also not at all clear that it was laid out specifically as a barony to which the grantee was entitled under his patent as a Cassique. It rather appears to have been a direct purchase from the Lords Proprietors. It has been included in this series, first, because it was generally known as a barony, but mainly by reason of the special interest attaching to its ownership successively by three persons who played prominent parts in the history of South Carolina.

The first grantee was John Smith. As to the identity of this particular John Smith with the Cassique of that name there has been some confusion. In 1675 there came to the Province a John Smith (or Smyth) who was recom-

mended by the Earl of Shaftsbury to the Governor and Council, in a letter dated 14 June, 1675, "as my particular "friend." The letter further instructed that a Manor should be set out to him "to any Number of Acres prescribed for "Man^{rs} in our Fundamentall Constitutions."

The number of acres prescribed in those Constitutions for a Manor was not less than 3,000.²

This John Smith arrived in 1675 with his wife and a number of servants, and received warrants in that year for land to be laid out to him aggregating 1,800 acres.³

The land actually laid out and granted to him on 20th November, 1676, was a tract of 1,800 acres on the Ashley River, opposite the barony of the Earl of Shaftsbury and at a place called by the Indian name of Booshoo, Boochaw or Boochawee. It included the site of the later town of Dorchester and was subsequently transferred or regranted to the settlers of that Town.⁴

The name of the wife of this John Smith was certainly Mary. This John Smith certainly died prior to 28th April, 1682, for on that day letters of administration on his estate were applied for by his widow Mary Smith (or Smyth).⁵ Previous to his death, from 1680 to 1681, he acted as deputy to one of the Proprietors. His widow, Mary Smith, subsequently, viz: December, 1682, married Arthur Middleton, and after his death for a third (so far as the record shows) husband, Ralph Izard.⁶ So far as the record shows this John Smith left no children, and his widow, when the wife of Ralph Izard, made a will devising to him her interest in the Boochaw property.⁷ This John Smith, whose wife was Mary, was, by the editor of the Shaftsbury papers (vol. V. of the Transactions of the S. C. Historical Society) and also by the present writer, assumed to have been the Cassique, but this as-

¹Collec^{ns} Hist: Soc: of S. C., vol. 5, p. 470.

²Ibid, p. 98.

³Printed Warrant Book, 1672-1679, pp. 105, 106, 110.

⁴S. C. Hist: and Genealogical Magazine, vol. 6, p. 63.

⁵Off: Hist: Comⁿ. S. C., vol. 1672-1692, p. 6.

⁶S. C. Hist: and Genealogical Magazine, vol. 6, p. 64.

⁷Ibid, vol. 5, p. 220.

sumption seems to have been an erroneous one, from the following:

In May, 1682, the Lords Proprietors write to the Governor and Council that M^r. John Smith had agreed for 10,000 acres of land, but that the conveyances could not be prepared so as to be forwarded by the same ship as their letter, but that his agents could select the 10,000 acres, but no grants should be made until further instructions.⁸

On 21st November, 1682, the Lords Proprietors write to the Governor and Council that they had granted patents for Cassiques to six persons, one of whom was "M^r. Jno: "Smith."⁹ On 13th November, 1682, a warrant was issued to lay out 6,000 acres of land to "M^r. John Smyth & Anne "his wife" to be laid out pursuant to the instructions of the Lords Proprietors dated 10th May, 1682.¹⁰ On 27th January, 1682/3 a formal grant with the usual plat attached was issued to "John Smith and Anne his wife" for 5,800 acres.¹¹ Later, viz: on 9th March 1682/3, warrants were issued to lay out to "John Smyth & Anne his wife" 140 acres, due for two servants brought to the Province in September, 1682, and a "Towne lott in Colleton County."¹² (Presumably at Wiltown or New London.)

It would appear more plausible that the dignity of a Cassique conferred on 21st November, 1682, was conferred on the John Smith whose wife was Anne, and who had in May, 1682, agreed for 10,000 acres and had actually in November, 1682, procured a warrant for 6,000 acres, than on the John Smith whose wife was Mary, who had several years before received a grant for but 1,800 acres and who had died prior to 28th April, 1682, seven months before the patent was issued.

⁸Collec^{ns}. Hist: Soc: of S. C., vol. 1, p. 106.

Calendar State Papers America and West Indies, vol. 1681-1685, p. 234.

⁹Rivers Hist: Sketch of S. C., p. 397.

Calendar State Papers America and West Indies, vol. 1681-1685, p. 339.

¹⁰Printed Warrant Book, 1680-1692, p. 73.

¹¹Off: Hist: Comⁿ. Memo. Bk., vol. 1, p. 500.

¹²Printed Warrant Book, 1680-1692, pp. 78, 79.

The John Smith to whom the warrant for 6,000 acres was issued would appear from the record to have been in the Province when the land was granted, arriving with his servants in September, 1682. He does not further appear on the record, which likewise fails to show to what extent he settled up and improved his grant of 5,800 acres.

We next find the barony in the possession of Joseph Boone, who gives the following statement in the Memorial, stating his ownership made in 1733 concerning its acquisition by him:

"Five thousand eight hundred acres granted to John
 "Smith and Ann his wife the 13 March 1682 in Col-
 "leton County butting & bounding Easterly on the
 "Fresh River of Edisto and Westerly on land not yet
 "run out and Northerly and Southerly on land not
 "yet laid out the said Five thousand eight hundred
 "acres being in joint tenancy to said John Smith and
 "Ann his wife the aforesaid John Smith being the
 "first that dyed the sole right was then vested in his
 "wife Ann and by certain conveyances from her the
 "said Ann (then widow) to her Nephew John Smith
 "and Frances his wife and from them by a certain
 "deed of Lease & Release from said John Smith and
 "Frances his wife bearing date the 18th February 1711
 "conveyed to Joseph Boone & is now in his occupa-
 "tion."¹³

Of Joseph Boone, it appears from the record that he was the son of Thomas Boone of London, Merchant, and Sarah his wife, and apparently came to South Carolina about 1694. He was a merchant engaged in trading between England and the Province, and in 1704 was sent to England to represent the party in the Province that was in opposition to Governor Johnson and those in favor of the Church Act. He took an active part in the political life of the Province, and in 1715 was sent with Richard Beresford to England to obtain if possible from the Pro-

¹³Off: Hist: Comm: S. C., Memo. Bk., vol. 3, p. 46.

prietors some abatement of the measures complained of by the Province, and if need be to invoke the assistance of the Crown against the Proprietors. In this, as in the other measures taken by the popular party which culminated in the revolution of 1720, Boone was conspicuous and active against the Proprietary government.¹⁴ He had a house in Charles Town as well as his place in the country¹⁵, and in 1715 during the Yemassee war an irruption of Appalachee Indians plundered and burned his settlement on the barony on the Edisto and destroyed a ship he was then building.¹⁶

He married Anne Alexander, one of the daughters of Landgrave Daniel Axtell and the widow of John Alexander.¹⁷ He died in 1734 without children, and by his will devised certain of his property, including this barony, to his widow for life, and after her death to the sons of his brother, Charles Boone, by his second marriage.¹⁸

He directed in his will that he be buried at Mt. Boone. Mt. Boone was a property of some 1,200 acres that had been given to his wife by her mother, Dame Rebecca Axtell, and is situate about 2 to 2½ miles Southwest of the present village of Summerville. M^{rs}. Poyas, the "Octogenarian Lady" the author of "Carolina in the Olden Time" states inaccurately:

"M^r. Boone his" (i. e. the second Landgrave Smith)
"friend was about his own age and married to his
"wife's sister Anne the daughter of Col. Blake who
"tells us in her will that her mother survived her
"father and gave her the plantation near Dorchester
"which she named Mount Boone; she willed the same
"to her nephew the Hon: Joseph Blake, who changed
"the name to Newington."

This statement of hers has been accepted and followed by others. It is wholly incorrect. Anne Boone was not

¹⁴M^cCrady S. C. under the Proprietary Government.

¹⁵Ibid, p. 469.

¹⁶Ibid, p. 570.

¹⁷Off: Hist: Comⁿ. Memo. Bk. 3. p. 46.

¹⁸Probate Court Charleston Book, 1732-37, p. 197.

a daughter of Col. Blake, who had no daughter named Anne,¹⁹ nor was she the sister of the wife of the second Landgrave, Thomas Smith, who did not himself marry a daughter of Col. Blake, and the Newington place and the Mt. Boone place were entirely distinct.²⁰ The Newington place received its name apparently from Dame Rebecca Axtell coeval with her settlement there and years before her daughter married Joseph Boone. The Newington place was by M^{rs}. Axtell given to her daughter Elizabeth, who married Colonel Joseph Blake, the son of the immigrant, Admiral Benjamin Blake, and under M^{rs}. Blake's will Newington passed to her son Joseph Blake, commonly called the Honorable Joseph Blake. To M^{rs}. Boone her mother gave an adjoining tract which (presumably, after M^{rs}. Boone's second marriage) was called Mt. Boone. The name still survives in "Boone Hill Church" the name given to a Methodist Church now on a part of the old Boone Hill tract, about one mile Southwest of Summerville. The old residences of Newington and Mt. Boone were about half a mile apart, separated by what was then rice fields and is now thick swamp. The road called the Orangeburg or Cypress road runs within 100 yards of the ruins of the old Mt. Boone mansion which now consists only of the brick foundations of an old brick house of considerable size.

¹⁹S. C. Hist: and Genealogical Magazine, vol. 13, p. 19.

²⁰The writer of this article has had occasion before this to call attention to grave inaccuracies on the part of M^{rs}. Poyas in her publications and desires to say in explanation, that M^{rs}. Poyas for her zeal and labor in the perpetuation of the history of her family and of her people deserves the thanks and gratitude of all. Having little opportunity to refer to contemporary records she relied upon family traditions, a most unsafe thing to do when it comes from a period so remote as a century and a half. The consequence is that for the earlier periods she is very inaccurate and even for her own family descent is not to be relied upon unless her statements can be verified and corroborated by some record.

Close by the old house is the following stone, now broken in half:

“Here Lyeth the Body of
“M^r. Joseph Boone
“Who departed this Life the 24th
“day of February 1734
“Aged 57 years”

During his lifetime Joseph Boone added to his Edisto barony by a number of grants of adjoining land (5 grants in number) aggregating 1886 acres, which added to the 5,800 acres granted to John Smith swelled the record acreage to 7,686.

Anne Boone, the widow of Joseph Boone died in 1751. By her will she makes certain devises to Charles and Thomas Boone, the children of her brother-in-law, Charles Boone, by Mary, his second wife.²¹ She also devised her Mt. Boone place to her nephew, the Honorable Joseph Blake, but for some reason (perhaps because the devise lapsed, he having apparently predeceased his aunt) the property seems to have been sold by her executors as going under the residuary clause of her will to her granddaughter, Ann Slan.

Under the terms of the will of Joseph Boone, upon the death of his widow the barony and other property went to his nephews, and in 1752 Thomas Boone, who had been born in England in 1729, came to Carolina and took possession. In 1759 he was appointed Governor of New Jersey, where he continued until 1762, when he was appointed Governor of South Carolina and held the post there until 1764. He purchased from Sir John Colleton the latter's residence near Charles Town, formerly known as Exmouth. It lay on the Cooper River, south of Magnolia Cemetery, at a place afterwards occupied by the Oaks Club and now by the tanks of the Standard Oil Co. The name was changed (possibly by the last Sir John Colleton) to that of “Bachelors Hall.” The administration of Governor Boone in South Carolina was not a successful

²¹Probate Court Charleston Bk., 1747-52, p. 459.

one. He quarreled with the General Assembly and seems to have received a good deal of adverse comment. He left in 1764, and if he afterwards returned to look after his estates in the Province the writer has not discovered any evidence of it on the record. He seems to have remained in England during the revolutionary war and the Legislature which met at Jacksonborough in 1782 included him among those subjects of the Crown in list No. 1 whose estates were confiscated as being subjects of his Britannic Majesty.²² He presented to the British Royal Commission of Enquiry into the losses and services of the American Loyalists a Memorial from which many of the facts here stated have been taken.²³ In this he states that the value of his property lost by confiscation was £41,207. 4^s. 4^d. Sterling, say \$200,700. This, however, includes his negro slaves on the barony, which, according to John Tunno, one of his witnesses, "were the best negroes he ever knew in "that part of the country."

The same General Assembly which passed this confiscation Act, passed an ordinance by which in recognition of the services of Major General Nathanael Greene three commissioners named in the ordinance were directed to invest ten thousand guineas in the purchase of an estate to be presented to him by the State of South Carolina.²⁴

The Hon: William Johnson of South Carolina (one of the Associate Justices of the U. S. Supreme Court) the official biographer of General Greene, in that he was selected by the family to act as such and had all General Greene's papers turned over to him for the purpose, writes of this presentation as follows:²⁵

"In South Carolina, Boones Barony, a very valuable
"body of land to the south of the Edisto, with a pro-
"portion of the slaves attached to the land as the
"property of one of the confiscated estates, were or-

²²Stats. of S. C., vol. 4, p. 516; vol. 6, p. —

²³Lenox Library, N. Y., Transcripts, Schedule of Losses of So. Ca. Claimants, vol. 2, pp. 437-475.

²⁴Stats. of S. C., vol. 4, p. 515.

²⁵Ibid., vol. 2, p. 401.

“dered by the Legislature to be conveyed to General
“Greene. As there were a number of other slaves
“constituting a part of the same gang, he made ap-
“plication to the Legislature, to have a value set upon
“them, and give him credit for a few years, that he
“may be enabled to purchase them. This also was
“immediately acquiesced in. The slaves were valued
“and transferred to him, and thus he became not only
“a slave owner, but a slave purchaser, a characteristic
“which gave no little umbrage to his quondam friends
“the Quakers, and which has been often dwelt on with
“some surprise, by those who were acquainted with
“his early enthusiasm in the cause of human freedom.”

The barony lay between Parker's Ferry on the Edisto River and Jacksonboro, and it was in this region that Greene was encamped for months in 1781 and 1782. He had ample opportunity to inspect the lands and observe the negro slaves and their health and capability, and there can be but little doubt but that the selection by the Commissioners of this estate to be presented to him was approved of, if not suggested, by him.

The journal of the Senate for the session in 1782 shows that it was reported to that body that upon surveying Boone's Barony it was found to contain much more land than at first reported and that the ten thousand guineas was not enough to pay for it all. Thereupon it was resolved to give him the whole tract.

The record shows, that by a deed dated 16th May, 1782,²⁸ the Commissioners of Forfeited Estates, under the Act of 1782, conveyed to Major General Nathanael Greene for £14,865. 12^s. 10^d. Sterling the plantation late the property of Thomas Boone, on the west side of Edisto River, containing 6,640 acres.

The acreage stated in the deed is only 6,640 acres, but as appeared by the later survey made in 1796 the actual acreage was 7,420 acres, substantially the original grant to John and Ann Smith, with the additions made by

²⁸M. C. O. Charleston Bk. M. 5, p. 448.

Joseph Boone. The value stated, £14,865. 12^s. 10^d. Sterling, presumably represents the total value exceeding the 10,000 guineas which the Legislature originally agreed to donate, and it would appear therefore that General Greene received an estate which was supposed to contain 6,640 acres, worth £14,865. 12^s. 10^d., but which in reality contained 7,420 acres and was worth correspondingly more. This value, say about \$72,395.75 in U. S. currency, was a prodigious one for the times, especially in the impoverished condition of a war devastated people, and shows that the property, when conveyed to General Greene, must have been in very excellent condition, both with regard to the extent and title of the arable acreage and to the buildings and plantation equipment. It certainly appears that no considerations of petty limitation restricted the generosity of the people of South Carolina, either in the original donation or its enlargement at the suggestion of the recipient.

Criticism of a considerable and invidious character was directed at General Greene because notwithstanding his Quaker antecedents and early atmosphere he became a large slave owner, and as a large landed proprietor in the South was one of that class subsequently execrated as being mercenary traders in human flesh and heartless slave drivers. He seems to have removed his slaves from their homes in South Carolina to Georgia, but there is nothing in the record to show that like some others who changed principles for profit and joined the same class, he ever abused by any ill treatment those in his power as their owner and master.

He no doubt possessed that large mindedness that enabled him to recognize that if he was to utilize the estates donated to him by the gratitude of the Southern States he could do so only by resorting to the sole supply of labor that the region and the times permitted, viz: negro slaves.

Exactly what General Greene did in the way of utilization of the barony it is impossible now to say.

The State of Georgia followed the example set by South

Carolina in recognizing in a most concrete way the services of General Greene.²⁷

“The beautiful and highly improved place of the “late Governor Graham in Georgia” (also confiscated) “called Mulberry Grove (the *la plus beille* of the conquered lands) was ordered to be conveyed to him; “and with a most delicate attention to the comfort and “known personal attachment to himself and Wayne, “the adjoining plantation was conveyed to the latter.”

In 1785 General Greene established his residence in Georgia at Mulberry Grove and seems to have removed his slaves there from South Carolina. He died not long afterwards, on 19th June, 1786.

He died considerably involved financially, mainly to creditors at the North who were pressing for settlement, and his widow had great difficulties in her attempts to extricate his estate. What use she made of the property on the Edisto River in South Carolina does not appear, but judgments were recovered against the estate and in 1801 the South Carolina property was sold by the Sheriff. The estate was sold in the subdivisions designated on a plat from a resurvey made in 1796, which found the contents to be 7,420 acres, and was disposed of in two tracts.

To Andrew Burnet was sold on 3^d Nov'r, 1801, four of these subdivisions, viz: No. 1, called the Old Ground, No. 4, called Turkey hill, No. 6 and No. 7, aggregating 4,517 acres and covering all the barony lying between the public road to Ashepoo and the Edisto River.²⁸ To Felix Warley on the same day was sold tract No. 2, called the Savannah, No. 3, called the New Ground and No. 5, aggregating 2,903 acres, comprising the remainder of the barony lying south or west of the public road.²⁹

The part purchased by Andrew Burnet was afterwards divided into two plantations, the Northern containing 1,505

²⁷Johnsons Greene *Ibid*.

²⁸M. C. O. Charleston Bk. J. 8, p. 200.

²⁹*Ibid*, Bk. A. 8, p. 446.

acres, called "Forlorn Hope" and the Southern called "Green Meadows" containing 3,015 acres. The destruction of the records of Colleton County during the invasion of the State by Sherman's army makes it impossible to further trace with much accuracy the devolution of these properties.

A Dr. Joseph Glover seems to have owned "Forlorn Hope" in 1838. He devised it to his daughter, M^{rs}. Elizabeth S. Postell and by the latter's children it was sold away subsequent to 1865. The tract purchased by Felix Warley continued in his family until about 1904, when it was also sold away. The map published with this article is taken from a copy of the map made in 1796. Adjoining the barony to the south and southwest were the two plantations called "Hayne Hall" and "Pear Hill" which belonged to Col: Isaac Hayne the revolutionary officer who was executed on the gibbet by the British in August, 1781, and whose plantation entries with regard to the two places have been published in previous numbers of this Magazine. "Hayne Hall" seems to have been his home and residence and it was in the garden at this residence that he was buried after his execution. This is stated on the authority of Col. Stephen Jarvis, then a British officer, a Lieutenant in Major Fraser's command, who states that he saw his grave the day after he was buried.³⁰ In his will Col. Hayne directs that he be buried by the side of his wife.³¹ Hayne had been captured about a month before, not far from his home. Exactly where the writer has not been able to locate. Johnson in his Traditions of the Revolution (not a very safe authority) says at the plantation of a M^{rs}. Ford about four miles beyond Parker's ferry. The Royal Gazette of the date says in general terms at the Horse Shoe, which referring to the Horse Shoe Creek or Swamp might mean anywhere within five or ten miles from Parker's ferry and about the same from Hayne's own home. Some revenge for Hayne came soon, for the very next day Major Fraser's command encountered General Marion's on the cause-

³⁰Journal of American History, vol. 1, No. 4, p. 728.

³¹Probate Court Charleston, Will Bk. A., p. 41.

way leading to Parker's ferry and suffered a "sad disaster." According to Jarvis, "We lost one hundred and twenty-five killed and a great many wounded, and the enemy "retired without the loss of a man. All our artillery were "killed or wounded before they could bring their guns to "bear upon the enemy."³² This incident is no part of the history of the barony, but is referred to here to draw attention to this account of Jarvis, whose MSS. published in the *Journal of American History*, is a most valuable contribution to the history of the revolutionary war in lower Carolina. This severe disaster inflicted by Marion on the enemy on the Parker's ferry causeway has never been given its proper position and credit, although one may be permitted to doubt if the number in dead alone could, as appears in the printed statement of Jarvis', have been 125. Considering the number engaged and giving due proportion to the wounded that number seems impossible. According to McCrady, citing James Life of Marion, the Americans next day counted twenty-seven dead *horses* on the field; the British had already buried their dead.

³²Ibid.